## <u>REMARKS</u>

The present application was filed on October 30, 2003 with claims 1-36.

In the outstanding Office Action dated April 9, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Huang et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0056029 (hereinafter "Huang").

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments above and remarks below.

With regard to the §102(e) rejections, Applicants initially note that MPEP §2131 specifies that a given claim is anticipated "only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference," citing Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, MPEP §2131 further indicates that the cited reference must show the "identical invention . . . in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim," citing Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of anticipation of claims 1-36 by the Huang reference.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a method for customizing a user-interface control of an existing application. A procedure description comprising a series of actions performed by a user in the application user-interface is recorded. The user-interface control is installed relating to the procedure description in the existing application for execution of the procedure description and generation of the series of actions when the user-interface control is activated.

Huang discloses a methodology for customizing Java application program interface (API) implementations. The Examiner first equates the customizing of an API implementation and the customizing a user interface. Applicants respectfully disagree with Examiner's contentions. Applicants assert the Examiner has failed to appreciate the difference between an API and a user-interface. An API is the interface between the application, and the operating system as shown in Huang FIG. 4. The user-interface as described in the present Application is an interface between the application and the user. Further, while Huang discloses the collection of user selections for selection of needed files to be in included in a JAR file, it fails to disclose the

Attorney Docket No.: YOR920030395US1

recording of a procedure description comprising a series of actions performed by a user. Finally, while Huang discloses the customization of a JAR file, it fails to describe the installation of a user-interface control, and also fails to disclose that the user-interface control relates to the procedure description comprising a series of actions performed by the user in the user-interface.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-36 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 9, 2007

Robert W. Griffith

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 48,956

Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP

90 Forest Avenue

Locust Valley, NY 11560

(516) 759-4547